

BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Bundy, D. and Hart, Sarah (2009) The case of equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* 29 (2), pp. 215-227. ISSN 0925-9899.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/1954/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively

**Birkbeck ePrints: an open access repository of the
research output of Birkbeck College**

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk>

Bundy, D. and Hart, S.

The case of equality in the Livingstone-Wagner
Theorem

Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics – 29(2), pp.
215-227 (2009)

This is an exact copy of an article published in *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, (ISSN: 0925-9899) made available here with kind permission of: © 2009 Edinburgh University Press. All rights reserved.

All articles available through Birkbeck ePrints are protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Citation for this version:

Bundy, D. and Hart, S.

The case of equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem

London: Birkbeck ePrints. Available at: <http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/1954>

Citation for publisher's version:

Bundy, D. and Hart, S.

The case of equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem

Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics – 29(2), pp. 215-227 (2009)

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk>

Contact Birkbeck ePrints at lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk

The case of equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem

David Bundy, Sarah Hart

Abstract

Let G be a permutation group acting on a set Ω of size $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $1 \leq k < (n - 1)/2$. Livingstone and Wagner proved that the number of orbits of G on k -subsets of Ω is less than or equal to the number of orbits on $(k + 1)$ -subsets. We investigate the cases when equality occurs.

1 Introduction

Throughout this article we let G be a permutation group acting on a set Ω of size $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $1 \leq k < (n - 1)/2$. In [6] Livingstone and Wagner proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *(Livingstone, Wagner) [6] The number of orbits of G on k -subsets of Ω is less than or equal to the number of orbits on $(k + 1)$ -subsets.*

Alternative proofs were subsequently given by Robinson [7] and Cameron [1] who extended the result to Ω infinite. An investigation of the cases when equality occurs for Ω infinite was then made by Cameron [1], [2] and Cameron and Thomas [5]. The case of equality also follows from a stronger “intersection property” examined by Cameron, Neumann and Saxl [4]. In this article, we will prove some similar results about the case of equality when Ω is finite.

In Section 2 we consider the case when G is intransitive. We show (see Lemma 2.1) that G must have one orbit of length at least $n - k$ and (see Proposition 2.2) that the action of G on this orbit satisfies a strong condition which in almost all cases forces G to be k -homogeneous on this orbit.

Transitive but imprimitive groups are then investigated in Section 3. In this case there are too many examples for a complete classification to be feasible, so we concentrate on finding a necessary condition for the sizes and number of blocks in a system of imprimitivity. This quickly reduces to a combinatorial problem of determining when the number of partitions of k into at most r parts of size at most s is the same as for $k + 1$. This problem is also of independent interest in invariant theory, where such partitions can be used to count the

number of linearly independent semi-invariants of degree r and weight k of a binary form of degree s . We are able to determine all the cases of equality for $r \leq 4$ (see Theorem 3.1) and conjecture that for $s \geq r \geq 5$, there are only finitely many cases of equality (see Conjecture 3.2 for details). Theorem 3.7 shows that for $s \geq r \geq 5$, equality can only occur when $2k \geq r(s-1) - 1$, that is k is close to half n . We have strong experimental evidence for believing Conjecture 3.2 to be true. We observe that for large enough fixed r and s the number of partitions of k into at most r parts of size at most s approximates to a Gaussian distribution whose peak becomes sharper for larger r and s .

In the final section we make some observations about the case when G is primitive. Aside from $(k+1)$ -homogeneous groups the only examples we know are the affine general linear groups over a field of size 2 (see Proposition 4.2) and a list of 19 further examples of degree at most 24, many of which are subgroups of M_{24} . The absence in [4] of any examples of degree greater than 24 suggests that such examples may also be rare or non-existent in our situation.

Notation and preliminary results

For each $0 \leq l \leq n$, let $\sigma_l(G)$ be the number of orbits of G on the set of l -subsets of Ω . A permutation group is said to be l -homogeneous if it is transitive in its action on l -subsets, that is $\sigma_l(G) = 1$. Let Δ be a G -invariant subset of Ω . Then G^Δ will denote the permutation group induced by G in its action on Δ .

Let H be a subgroup of a group G , χ be a character of G and ψ a character of H . Then $\chi \downarrow H$ will denote the restriction of χ to H and $\psi \uparrow G$ will denote the character induced by ψ on G . Furthermore 1_G will denote the trivial character on G .

Lemma 1.2. *Let $G \leq \text{Sym}(n)$, $0 \leq l \leq n$ and ψ_l be the character of $\text{Sym}(n)$ induced by the trivial character on $\text{Sym}(l) \times \text{Sym}(n-l)$. Then $\langle \psi_l \downarrow G, 1_G \rangle$ is the number of orbits of G on l -subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and if $0 \leq l < (n-1)/2$, then $\psi_{l+1} - \psi_l$ is an irreducible character of $\text{Sym}(n)$.*

Proof. See [7]. □

Lemma 1.3. *Let $H \leq G \leq \text{Sym}(n)$ and $1 \leq k < (n-1)/2$. Then $\sigma_{k+1}(G) - \sigma_k(G) \leq \sigma_{k+1}(H) - \sigma_k(H)$. In particular, if $\sigma_{k+1}(H) = \sigma_k(H)$, then $\sigma_{k+1}(G) = \sigma_k(G)$.*

Proof. Let $\chi := \psi_{k+1} - \psi_k$ be the irreducible character in the conclusion of Lemma 1.2. Then

$$\sigma_{k+1}(G) - \sigma_k(G) = \langle \chi \downarrow G, 1_G \rangle \leq \langle \chi \downarrow H, 1_H \rangle = \sigma_{k+1}(H) - \sigma_k(H).$$

In particular, if $\sigma_{k+1}(H) = \sigma_k(H)$, then the right-hand side is zero and by Theorem 1.1 the left-hand side is non-negative, so must also be zero. □

2 Intransitive groups with equality

In this section we investigate intransitive permutation groups which achieve equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $G \leq \text{Sym}(n)$ and suppose $\sigma_k(G) = \sigma_{k+1}(G)$ for some $1 \leq k < (n-1)/2$. Then G has an orbit of length at least $n-k$.*

Proof. Suppose G has no orbit of length at least $n-k$. Then $G \leq \text{Sym}(n-l) \times \text{Sym}(l) =: M$, for some $l \geq k+1$. But $\sigma_{k+1}(M) = k+2 > k+1 = \sigma_k(M)$, which contradicts Lemma 1.3. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let $G \leq \text{Sym}(n)$ and $1 \leq k < (n-1)/2$ with $\sigma_k(G) = \sigma_{k+1}(G)$. Let Δ be an orbit of G of length at least $n-k$. Then $\sigma_l(G^\Delta) = \sigma_{l+1}(G^\Delta)$, for all $k - (n - |\Delta|) \leq l \leq \min(k, |\Delta| - k - 2)$.*

Proof. Note that an orbit of length at least $n-k$ exists by Lemma 2.1. Let $M := G^\Delta \times \text{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \Delta) \geq G$ and let $m := |\Delta|$. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, two t -subsets of Ω are in the same M -orbit if and only if their intersections with Δ are in the same G^Δ -orbit. In particular, these intersections must be of the same size. Hence

$$\sigma_t(M) = \sum_{l=\max(0, t-(n-m))}^{\min(t, m)} \sigma_l(G^\Delta).$$

Now $m \geq n-k \geq (2k+1) - k = k+1$. Also $k - (n-m) \geq k + (n-k) - n = 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sigma_{k+1}(M) - \sigma_k(M) = \sum_{l=k+1-(n-m)}^{k+1} \sigma_l(G^\Delta) - \sum_{l=k-(n-m)}^k \sigma_l(G^\Delta) \\ &= \sigma_{k+1}(G^\Delta) - \sigma_{k-(n-m)}(G^\Delta). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\sigma_{k+1}(G^\Delta) = \sigma_{k-(n-m)}(G^\Delta)$. If $2k < m-1$ then the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem forces $\sigma_l(G^\Delta) = \sigma_{l+1}(G^\Delta)$, for each $k - (n-m) \leq l \leq k$.

On the other hand, suppose $2k \geq m-1$. Then $\sigma_{k+1}(G^\Delta) = \sigma_{m-(k+1)}(G^\Delta)$ and $m - (k+1)$ is within the range to which the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem applies. We also have that

$$(m - (k+1)) - (k - (n-m)) = (n-1) - 2k > 0.$$

Hence, by the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem, $\sigma_l(G^\Delta) = \sigma_{l+1}(G^\Delta)$, for each $k - (n-m) \leq l \leq m - k - 2$. Note that $\min(k, m - k - 2)$ is k precisely when $2k < m-1$ and $m - k - 2$ otherwise, so the proof is complete. \square

Proposition 2.2 provides the means to reduce the case of equality for an intransitive group to that of equality for a transitive group. Indeed if G is intransitive with an orbit Δ satisfying the condition of Proposition 2.2, then we nearly always have equality $\sigma_l(G^\Delta) = \sigma_{l+1}(G^\Delta)$ for several consecutive values of l . (If there is just one value of l then either G is already transitive or $n = 2k + 2$.) This almost forces G^Δ to be k -homogeneous. The only known exceptions with $k < (n - 1)/2$ are where $G^\Delta \cong M_{24}$ or M_{23} .

3 Imprimitive groups with equality

There is an abundance of imprimitive groups which achieve equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem and a complete classification of them seems intractable. Nevertheless, we are able to give a condition on the block sizes which is necessary if equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem holds. Observe that by Lemma 1.3, if $\sigma_k(H) = \sigma_{k+1}(H)$ holds for an imprimitive group H with r blocks of size s , then $\sigma_k(G) = \sigma_{k+1}(G)$, where $G \cong \text{Sym}(s) \wr \text{Sym}(r)$ is the full stabiliser in $\text{Sym}(rs)$ of the blocks of H . Note also that the number of orbits of G on k -subsets is equal to the number of ways, $P(r, s, k)$, to partition k into at most r parts of size at most s . We require $P(r, s, k) = P(r, s, k + 1)$. The following result is established by Lemma 3.5, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.9.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $r \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ with $r \leq s$ and $1 \leq k < (rs - 1)/2$. Then $P(r, s, k) = P(r, s, k + 1)$ if and only if one of the following holds.*

(a) $r = 2$ and k is even.

(b) $r = 3$ and

$$k = \begin{cases} \frac{3s-3}{2}, & \text{if } s \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{3s-4}{2}, & \text{if } s \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\ \frac{3s-2}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3s-6}{2}, & \text{if } s \equiv 2 \pmod{4}. \end{cases}$$

(c) $r = 4$ and $k = 2s - 2$ or $r = s = k = 4$.

We also make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 3.2. *Let $1 < r \leq s$, $1 \leq k < (rs - 1)/2$ and suppose $P(r, s, k) = P(r, s, k + 1)$. Then one of the following holds:*

(a) $r \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ and the possibilities for s and k are as in Theorem 3.1; or

(b) r, s and k have the values given by a column of the following table

r	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	7
s	6	10	14	6	7	9	11	12	10
k	14	24	34	16	20	26	32	38	34

Remark 3.3. *The quantity $P(r, s, k) - P(r, s, k - 1)$ is of interest in invariant theory. By a theorem of Cayley and Sylvester (see Satz 2.21 of [8]) it is equal to the number of linearly independent semi-invariants of degree r and weight k of a binary form of degree s . Conjecture 3.2, if proven, would then give the values of r, s and k for which no such semi-invariant exists.*

We now define some more notation which we will use in this section. Let $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k)$ be the set of partitions of k into at most r parts of size at most s , so $P(r, s, k) = |\mathcal{P}(r, s, k)|$. We will use the convention that $P(r, s, k) = 0$ if $k < 0$ or $k > rs$. By considering dual partitions we observe that $P(r, s, k) = P(s, r, k)$, so without loss we will assume that $r \leq s$. Elements of $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k)$ will be written (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r) where $\sum_{i=1}^r a_i = k$ and $s \geq a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_r \geq 0$. Let $\mathcal{A}(r, s, k)$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k)$ consisting of all partitions of the form (s, a_2, \dots, a_r) and let $\mathcal{B}(r, s, k + 1)$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k + 1)$ consisting of all partitions of the form (x, x, a_3, \dots, a_r) , for some $x \leq s$. Furthermore, let $A(r, s, k) = |\mathcal{A}(r, s, k)|$ and $B(r, s, k) = |\mathcal{B}(r, s, k)|$. Note that $A(r, s, k) = P(r - 1, s, k - s)$. We will define a bijection from a subset of $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k)$ to a subset of $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k + 1)$. Let $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r) \in \mathcal{P}(r, s, k)$ with $s > a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_r \geq 0$, and define

$$f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r) = (a_1 + 1, a_2, \dots, a_r).$$

Then f is a bijection from $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k) \setminus \mathcal{A}(r, s, k)$ to $\mathcal{P}(r, s, k + 1) \setminus \mathcal{B}(r, s, k + 1)$. In particular we have the following result.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $r, s, k \geq 1$. Then*

$$P(r, s, k + 1) - P(r, s, k) = B(r, s, k + 1) - A(r, s, k).$$

So the problem of determining when $P(r, s, k) = P(r, s, k + 1)$ reduces to that of determining when $B(r, s, k + 1) = A(r, s, k)$. We now consider in turn the cases when $r = 2, 3$ and 4 .

Lemma 3.5. *Let $s \geq 0$. Then*

$$P(2, s, k) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k > 2s, \text{ or } k < 0, \\ s - \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil + 1, & \text{if } s \leq k \leq 2s, \\ \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq s. \end{cases}$$

In particular, if $1 \leq k < s$, then $P(2, s, k) = P(2, s, k + 1)$ if and only if k is even.

Proof. Elementary. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let $s \geq 3$ and $1 \leq k < (3s - 1)/2$. Then $P(3, s, k) = P(3, s, k + 1)$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (a) s is odd and $k = (3s - 3)/2$,
- (b) $s \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and $k = (3s - 4)/2$,
- (c) $s \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ and $k = (3s - 2)/2$ or $(3s - 6)/2$.

Proof. Let $d_k = P(3, s, k + 1) - P(3, s, k) = B(3, s, k + 1) - A(3, s, k)$. By Lemma 3.5,

$$A(3, s, k) = P(2, s, k - s) = \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{k-s}{2} \rfloor + 1 & \text{if } s \leq k < (3s - 1)/2, \\ 0 & \text{if } k \leq s. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$B(3, s, k + 1) = |\{(a, a, b) \mid s \geq a \geq b, 2a + b = k + 1\}| = \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{3} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Hence

$$B(3, s, k + 1) \geq \frac{k}{2} - \frac{k+3}{3} + 1 = \frac{k}{6} > 0.$$

So if $A(3, s, k) = 0$, then $d_k \geq k/6 > 0$. We may therefore assume that

$$s \leq k < (3s - 1)/2 \quad \text{and} \quad A(3, s, k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k-s}{2} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Thus

$$d_k = \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{3} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{k-s}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Suppose s is odd. Then $k + 1 \equiv k - s \pmod{2}$. Hence

$$d_k = \frac{k+1 - (k-s)}{2} - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{3} \right\rceil = \frac{s+1}{2} - \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{3} \right\rceil.$$

Therefore

$$d_k = 0 \Leftrightarrow k \in \left\{ \frac{3s+1}{2}, \frac{3s-1}{2}, \frac{3s-3}{2} \right\}.$$

Since $k < (3s - 1)/2$, this forces $k = \frac{3s-3}{2}$.

Suppose s is even. Then

$$d_k \geq \frac{k}{2} - \frac{k+3}{3} - \frac{k-s}{2} = \frac{1}{6}(3s - 2k - 6).$$

Assume $d_k = 0$. Then $2k \geq 3s - 6$. Thus $3s/2 - 3 \leq k \leq 3s/2 - 1$ and so $\lceil \frac{k+1}{3} \rceil = \frac{s}{2}$. Therefore

$$d_k = \begin{cases} \frac{k}{2} - \frac{s}{2} - \frac{k-s}{2} = 0, & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ \frac{k+1}{2} - \frac{s}{2} - \frac{k-s-1}{2} = 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd, a contradiction.} \end{cases}$$

Thus k is even, $\frac{3s-6}{2} \leq k \leq \frac{3s-2}{2}$ and hence

$$k = \begin{cases} \frac{3s-4}{2} & \text{if } s \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \\ \frac{3s-2}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3s-6}{2} & \text{if } s \equiv 2 \pmod{4}. \end{cases}$$

□

Theorem 3.7. *Let $4 \leq r \leq s$ and $1 \leq k < (rs - 1)/2$. If $P(r, s, k) = P(r, s, k + 1)$, then $k \geq (r(s - 1) - 1)/2$ or $r = s = k = 4$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $k < s$. Then $A(r, s, k) = 0$ but $B(r, s, k) > 0$, since $r \geq 4$. Therefore by Lemma 3.4 $P(r, s, k) < P(r, s, k + 1)$. Now suppose that $k = s \geq 5$. Then

$$P(r, s, k) = P(r, k, k) = 2 + P(r, k - 2, k)$$

and

$$P(r, s, k + 1) = P(r, k, k + 1) = 3 + P(r, k - 2, k + 1).$$

Since $(r(k - 2) - 1)/2 \geq (4(k - 2) - 1)/2 = 2k - 9/2 > k$, applying Theorem 1.1 yields $P(r, k - 2, k) \leq P(r, k - 2, k + 1)$ and so $P(r, s, k) < P(r, s, k + 1)$ in this case.

It remains to show for $s < k < (r(s - 1) - 1)/2$ that $P(r, s, k) < P(r, s, k + 1)$. So we assume for a contradiction that $P(r, s, k) = P(r, s, k + 1)$ in this case. Observe that

$$P(r, s, k) = P(r, s - 1, k) + P(r - 1, s, k - s).$$

Since $k < (r(s - 1) - 1)/2$ and $k - s < (r(s - 1) - 1 - 2s)/2 < ((r - 1)s - 1)/2$, by Theorem 1.1, $P(r, s - 1, k) \leq P(r, s - 1, k + 1)$ and $P(r - 1, s, k - s) \leq P(r - 1, s, k - s + 1)$. So under our assumption we have $P(r - 1, s, k - s) = P(r - 1, s, k - s + 1)$. We now proceed by induction on r .

Suppose first that $r = 4$. Then by Proposition 3.6, $P(3, s, k - s) = P(3, s, k - s + 1)$ implies $3s/2 - 3 \leq k - s \leq 3s/2 - 1$. However $k < (4(s - 1) - 1)/2 = 2s - 5/2$, so $k - s \leq s - 3 < 3s/2 - 3$, a contradiction.

Now suppose $r > 4$ and the result holds for $r - 1$ in place of r . Since $P(r - 1, s, k - s) = P(r - 1, s, k - s + 1)$, we obtain by induction that

$$k - s \geq \frac{(r-1)(s-1)-1}{2} = \frac{rs-r-s}{2}.$$

Hence $k \geq (rs - r + s)/2 > (rs - 1)/2$, a contradiction. Therefore by induction the result holds for all $r \geq 4$. □

Proposition 3.8. *Let $s \geq 4$ and $2s - 2 \leq k \leq 2s - 1$. Then $P(4, s, k) = P(4, s, k + 1)$ if and only if $k = 2s - 2$.*

Proof. Since $r = 4$ is fixed, for this proof we will abbreviate $A(r, s, k)$ by $A(s, k)$ and $B(r, s, k)$ by $B(s, k)$. We first show that for all $s \geq 4$, $P(4, s, 2s - 2) = P(4, s, 2s - 1)$. We need to evaluate $B(s, k)$ more precisely. Now

$$\mathcal{B}(s, k) = \{(a, a, b, c) : s \geq a \geq b \geq c \geq 0, 2a + b + c = k\}.$$

Now $0 \leq b + c \leq 2a$ implies $2a \leq k \leq 4a$. Hence $\lceil \frac{k}{4} \rceil \leq a \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$. Thus

$$B(s, k) = \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{k}{4} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} P(2, a, k - 2a).$$

By Lemma 3.5, the value of $P(2, a, k - 2a)$ depends on whether $0 \leq k - 2a \leq a$ or $a \leq k - 2a \leq 2a$. Now $2a - (k - 2a) = 4a - k \geq 0$. Also $k - 2a \geq a$ whenever $a \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{3} \rfloor$. Therefore by Lemma 3.5

$$B(s, k) = \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{k}{4} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{3} \rfloor} (a - \lceil \frac{k-2a}{2} \rceil + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{k}{3} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} (\lfloor \frac{k-2a}{2} \rfloor + 1). \quad (1)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} B(s, 2s - 1) &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{2s-1}{4} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor} (a - \lceil \frac{2s-1-2a}{2} \rceil + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{2} \rfloor} (\lfloor \frac{2s-1-2a}{2} \rfloor + 1) \\ &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor} (2a - s + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 1}^{s-1} (s - a) \\ &= (1 - s) (\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil + 1) + \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor (\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 1) - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil (\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil - 1) \\ &\quad + s (s - 1 - \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor) - \frac{1}{2}(s - 1)s + \frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor (\lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 1) \\ &= \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor (\frac{3}{2} \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 1 + 1 - s - s + \frac{1}{2}) + \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil (-\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil + s - 1 + 1) \\ &\quad + 1 - s + s^2 - s - \frac{1}{2}s^2 + \frac{1}{2}s \\ B(s, 2s - 1) &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor (3 \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 5 - 4s)}_{X_3(B)} + \underbrace{\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil (s - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil) + \frac{1}{2}(s^2 - 3s + 2)}_{X_2(B)} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $X_2(B)$ depends only on s modulo 2 and $X_3(B)$ depends only on s modulo 3.

We now work out $A(s, 2s - 2)$ in a similar fashion. Firstly note that $A(s, 2s - 2) = P(3, s, s - 2) = P(3, s - 2, s - 2)$, and

$$P(3, s - 2, s - 2) = \#\{a, b, c : a \geq b \geq c \geq 0, a + b + c = s - 2\}.$$

This implies that $\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil \leq a \leq s - 2$. Thus $A(s, 2s - 2) = \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil}^{s-2} P(2, a, s - 2 - a)$. From Lemma 3.5, and noting that $s - 2 - a \geq a$ when $a \leq \lfloor \frac{s-2}{2} \rfloor$, we make the following calculation.

$$\begin{aligned} A(s, 2s - 2) &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{s-2}{2} \rfloor} (a - \lceil \frac{s-2-a}{2} \rceil + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{s-2}{2} \rfloor + 1}^{s-2} (\lfloor \frac{s-2-a}{2} \rfloor + 1) \\ &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor - 1} (a - (s - 2 - a)) + \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil}^{s-2} (\lfloor \frac{s-a}{2} \rfloor) \\ &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor - 1} (2a - s + 2) + \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil}^{s-2} \left(\frac{s-a}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \# \{i \in \{2, \dots, s - \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil\} : i \text{ odd}\} \end{aligned}$$

Now the number of odd numbers in the range $\{2, \dots, x\}$ is $\lfloor \frac{x-1}{2} \rfloor$, so the number of odd numbers in $\{2, \dots, s - \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil\}$ is $\left\lfloor \frac{\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor - 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{6} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{s-1}{3} \rfloor$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} A(s, 2s - 2) &= (2 - s) \left(\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil \right) + \lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor \left(\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor - 1 \right) - \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil \left(\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil - 1 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{s}{2} (s - 2 - \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil + 1) - \frac{1}{4} (s - 2)(s - 1) + \frac{1}{4} \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil \left(\lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{s-1}{3} \rfloor \\ &= \lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor \left(2 - s + \lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor - 1 \right) + \frac{s}{2} (s - 1) - \frac{1}{4} (s - 2)(s - 1) \\ &\quad + \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil \left(s - 2 - \frac{3}{4} \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil + \frac{3}{4} - \frac{s}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{s-1}{3} \rfloor \\ A(s, 2s - 2) &= \underbrace{\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor \left(\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor + 1 - s \right) + \frac{1}{4} (s - 1)(s + 2)}_{X_2(A)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{4} \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil (2s - 5 - 3 \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil) - \frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{s-1}{3} \rfloor}_{X_3(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

Again note that $X_2(A)$ depends only on s modulo 2 and $X_3(A)$ depends only on s modulo 3.

Now $P(4, s, 2s - 2) = P(4, s, 2s - 1)$ if and only if $B(s, 2s - 1) = A(s, 2s - 2)$, which is if and only if $X_2(B) - X_2(A) = X_3(A) - X_3(B)$. We have

$$X_2(B) - X_2(A) = \left(\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil \left(s - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil \right) + \frac{1}{2} (s^2 - 3s + 2) \right) - \left(\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor \left(\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor + 1 - s \right) + \frac{1}{4} (s - 1)(s + 2) \right).$$

A simple calculation shows that regardless of whether s is odd or even, $X_2(B) - X_2(A) = \frac{1}{4}(3s^2 - 9s + 6)$.

$$X_3(A) - X_3(B) = \left(\frac{1}{4} \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil (2s - 5 - 3 \lceil \frac{s-2}{3} \rceil) - \frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{s-1}{3} \rfloor \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor (3 \lfloor \frac{2s-1}{3} \rfloor + 5 - 4s) \right).$$

Calculating for each possible value of s modulo 3 shows that in each case, $X_3(A) - X_3(B) = \frac{1}{4}(3s^2 - 9s + 6) = X_2(B) - X_2(A)$. Therefore, for all $s \geq 4$, $P(4, s, 2s-2) = P(4, s, 2s-1)$.

We now show that $P(4, s, 2s-1) < P(4, s, 2s)$ for all $s \geq 4$. Since $P(4, s, 2s-2) = P(4, s, 2s-1)$ for all $s \geq 4$, by substituting $s+1$ for s in Lemma 3.4 we have

$$A(s+1, 2s) = B(s+1, 2s+1). \quad (2)$$

Now $A(s, 2s-1) = P(3, s, s-1) = P(3, s-1, s-1)$ as no part of a partition of $s-1$ can exceed $s-1$. Similarly $A(s+1, 2s) = P(3, s+1, s-1) = P(3, s-1, s-1)$. Hence

$$A(s, 2s-1) = A(s+1, 2s). \quad (3)$$

Now we consider $B(s+1, 2s+1)$ compared to $B(s, 2s)$.

Setting $k+1 = 2s$ and $k+1 = 2s+1$, respectively, gives:

$$\begin{aligned} B(s, 2s) &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor} (a - (s-a) + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor + 1}^s (s-a+1) \\ &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor} (2a - s + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor + 1}^s (s-a+1); \\ B(s+1, 2s+1) &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{2s+1}{4} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor} (a - (s-a+1) + 1) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor + 1}^s ((s-a) + 1) \\ &= \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s+1}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor} (2a - s) + \sum_{a=\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor + 1}^s (s-a+1). \end{aligned}$$

If $\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor$, then $B(s, 2s) - B(s+1, 2s+1) \geq \sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor} 1 \geq \frac{2s-1}{3} - \frac{s-1}{2} > 0$.

If $\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor < \lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor$ then $\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor = \frac{2s-2}{3}$, $\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor = \frac{2s+1}{3}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} B(s, 2s) - B(s+1, 2s+1) &\geq \left(\sum_{a=\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor} 1 \right) - (2\lfloor \frac{2s+1}{3} \rfloor - s) + (s - (\lfloor \frac{2s}{3} \rfloor + 1) + 1) \\ &\geq \frac{2s-2}{3} - \frac{s-1}{2} - \frac{4s+2}{3} + 2s - \frac{2s-2}{3} \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(-3s + 3 - 8s - 4 + 12s) = \frac{1}{6}(s-1) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in any case $B(s, 2s) > B(s+1, 2s+1)$. Therefore by equations (2) and (3),

$$B(s, 2s) - A(s, 2s-1) > B(s+1, 2s+1) - A(s+1, 2s) = 0.$$

Hence by Lemma 3.4 $P(4, s, 2s-1) < P(4, s, 2s)$. □

Proposition 3.9. *Let $s \geq 4$ and $1 \leq k \leq 2s - 1$. Then $P(4, s, k) = P(4, s, k + 1)$ if and only if $k = 2s - 2$ or $s = k = 4$.*

Proof. In the case $s = k = 4$ it be easily computed that $P(4, 4, 4) = P(4, 4, 5) = 5$. Otherwise, by Theorem 3.7, if $P(4, s, k) = P(4, s, k + 1)$, then $4(s - 1) - 1 \leq 2k$ and, since k is an integer, $2s - 2 \leq k$. We may now apply Proposition 3.8 to get the result. \square

Theorem 3.1 now follows immediately from Lemma 3.5, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.9.

4 Primitive groups with equality

Primitive groups which are not $(k+1)$ -homogeneous but achieve equality in the Livingstone-Wagner Theorem for some $k < (n - 1)/2$ are fairly rare.

Remark 4.1. *The known primitive but not $(k + 1)$ -homogeneous groups G such that $\sigma_k(G) = \sigma_{k+1}(G)$, for some $k < (n - 1)/2$, are:*

- (a) $AGL(m, 2)$, for $m \geq 4, n = 2^m, k = 4$,
- (b) $ASL(2, 3)$ or $AGL(2, 3)$, for $n = 9, k = 3$,
- (c) $Sym(5), Sym(6), PGL(2, 9)$ or $P\Gamma L(2, 9)$, for $n = 10, k = 4$,
- (d) $M_{11}, PSL(2, 11), PGL(2, 11)$, for $n = 12, k = 4$,
- (e) $PSL(3, 3)$, for $n = 13, k = 4$,
- (f) $PGL(2, 13)$, for $n = 14, k = 4$,
- (g) $2^4 : Alt(6), 2^4 : Sym(6), 2^4 : Alt(7)$, for $n = 16, k = 6$,
- (h) $PGL(2, 17)$, for $n = 18, k = 6$ or 8 ,
- (i) M_{22} or $Aut(M_{22})$, for $n = 22, k = 8$,
- (j) M_{23} , for $n = 23, k = 8, 9$,
- (k) M_{24} , for $n = 24, k = 6, 8, 9$ or 10 .

Observe that many of these groups are subgroups of M_{24} .

Regarding case (a), we prove the following.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $G = AGL(m, 2)$, for $m \geq 4$, acting naturally on an m -dimensional vector space V over $GF(2)$. Then $\sigma_4(G) = \sigma_5(G) = 2$.*

Proof. Observe that the stabiliser in G of any three points of V fixes the fourth point in the unique affine plane containing these three points and is transitive on the remaining points of V . It follows that $\sigma_4(G) = 2$ and also G has a single orbit on the set of 5-subsets which contain affine planes. Let Δ be any set of five distinct points in V which does not contain any affine plane. Then Δ is not contained in an affine 3-dimensional subspace of V . Furthermore the stabiliser in G of an affine 3-dimensional subspace W is transitive on pairs (α, Λ) , where α is a point not in W and Λ is any set of four points in W which is not an affine plane. Therefore G has a single orbit on 5-subsets which do not contain any affine plane. Thus $\sigma_5(G) = 2$. \square

References

- [1] Cameron, Peter J., Transitivity of permutation groups on unordered sets. Math. Z. 148 (1976), no. 2, 127–139.
- [2] Cameron, Peter J., Orbits of permutation groups on unordered sets. J. London Math. Soc. (2) 17 (1978), no. 3, 410–414.
- [3] Cameron, Peter J., Orbits of permutation groups on unordered sets. II. J. London Math. Soc. (2) 23 (1981), no. 2, 249–264.
- [4] Cameron, Peter J., Neumann, Peter M., Saxl, Jan., An interchange property in finite permutation groups. Bull. London Math. Soc. 11 (1979), no. 2, 161–169.
- [5] Cameron, Peter J., Thomas, Simon, Groups acting on unordered sets. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 59 (1989), no. 3, 541–557.
- [6] Livingstone, D., Wagner, A., Transitivity of finite permutation groups on unordered sets. Math. Z. 90 (1965) 393–403.
- [7] Robinson, G. de B., Note on a theorem of Livingstone and Wagner., Math. Z. 102 (1967) 351–352.
- [8] Schur, I., Vorlesungen Über Invariantentheorie. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Helmut Grunsky. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 143 Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1968.